

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Group Art Unit: 3643

Examiner: Price, Richard Thomas Jr.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION
OF ABANDONMENT

3643

Serial No.: 10/005,797

MICKE et al.

Atty. File No.: 3957-8-DIV

Filed: November 2, 2001

For: "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR

REMOVING OBSTRUCTIONS IN

MINES"

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313

SEP 0 4 2003 GROUP 3600

Dear Sir:

"EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL NUMBER: EV 331291709 US DATE OF DEPOSIT: 8/28/03

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE" SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.10 ON THE DATE INDICATED ABOVE AND IS ADDRESSED TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450.

YPED OR PRINTED NAME: Mary Anne Davitt

SIGNATURE: WARLAND BAINT

A Notice of Abandonment was mailed in connection with the above-identified patent application on July 24, 2003. Applicants respectfully traverse the holding of abandonment, on the grounds that a timely response to the Office Action of December 3, 2002 was filed.

On February 21, 2003, an Amendment and Response in reply to the Office Action of

December 3, 2002, was mailed to the Patent Office under a certificate of mailing in accordance with 10/23/2003 CCOFER 00000003 191970 10005797
01 FC::1202 37 C::E.R. Sal.8. A copy of the Amendment and Response is attached as Exhibit A. A postcard receipt submitted to the Patent Office with the Amendment and Response, and date-stamped by the OIPE on February 21, 2003, was received by the office of the Applicant's attorneys on March 6, 2003, and evidences the timely filing of the Amendment and Response (see Exhibit B).

In addition, the office of Applicants' attorneys was contacted by the Examiner by telephone regarding the status of the application. During that telephone conference, it became apparent thou

the Amendment and Response of February 21, 2003, had not been matched with the patent

application file. Accordingly, a Request for Consideration of Amendment and Response was filed

by Applicants' attorneys under a certificate of mailing dated July 18, 2003. (Exhibit C). A postcard

receipt submitted to the Patent Office with the Request for Consideration of Amendment and

Response, and date stamped by the OIPE on July 18, 2003, was received by the office of the

Applicants' attorneys on July 28, 2003. (Exhibit D).

Because a timely response to the Office Action of December 3, 2002, was filed, there was

no abandonment in fact of this patent application. Furthermore, because a timely reply was filed,

there is no need to revive the patent application. Instead, the holding of abandonment should be

reconsidered and withdrawn, and the Amendment and Response filed on February 21, 2003 should

be considered in reply to the Office Action. (See M.P.E.P § 711.03).

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if doing so would expedite

the resolution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By:

Bradley M. Knepper Registration No. 44,189

1560 Broadway, Suite 1200

Denver, Colorado 80202-5141

(303) 863-9700

Date: August 28, 2003

-2-



D

EXHIBIT A



oplication No. 10/055,797

AMENDMENTS

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend Claim 1 and add new Claims 37-39 as follows:



(Once Amended) A system for launching a projectile to remove a body of 1. rock in an excavation, comprising:

a projectile that includes:

a nose, the nose being one of substantially flat and concave to inhibit deflection of the projectile from a face of the rock;

a body containing an explosive charge; and

a tail having a plurality of fins to control the trajectory of the projectile;

and

a tube for launching the projectile.



- 37. (New) The system of Claim 1, wherein said nose is concave.
- 38. (New) The system of Claim 1, wherein said nose is substantially flat.
- 39. (New) The system of Claim 1, wherein said nose has a diameter that is about equal to a maximum diameter of said projectile.

GROUP 3600

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Action dated December 3, 2002. In the amendments set forth above, Claim 1 has been amended without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter, and without narrowing the claim, Claims 37-39 are new, and no claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-8 and 37-39 are now pending. As set out more fully below, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,485,787 to Bowcutt et al. ("Bowcutt"). In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. (MPEP §2143). It is submitted that a *prima facie* case to reject Claims 1-8 has not been established. In particular, and as discussed more fully below, Bowcutt does not teach, suggest or disclose at least the feature of a projectile having a nose that is one of substantially flat and concave. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Claims 1-8 are not obvious in view of Bowcutt.

The Bowcutt reference is generally directed to a gas gun launched scramjet test projectile. The test projectile discussed by Bowcutt is designed to travel at velocities greater than Mach 5.

The projectile is propulsion-assisted and is used to enable the simulation of flow physics and the acquisition of performance data that correlates directly to those of a scramjet powered vehicle.

(Bowcutt, col. 4, lns. 5-7). Accordingly, the projectile discussed by Bowcutt is concerned with

the integration of the air frame and propulsion systems for vehicles or projectiles traveling at supersonic and hypersonic speeds. (See Bowcutt, col. 1, lns. 27-30). The projectile illustrated by Bowcutt includes a nose cap 101 secured to the forebody 102 to form an external surface that extends from the projectile nose tip 103 rearwardly to the vicinity of the leading edge of the cowl 110. (Bowcutt, col. 5, lns. 5-9). Because the projectile 100 is intended to travel at velocities greater than Mach 5 (Bowcutt Abstract, Claim 1), and because parameters that include the forebody and inlet contraction ratios, the inlet efficiency, etc., impacts the performance of ramjet and scramjet systems (Bowcutt, col. 1, ln. 65 to col. 2, ln. 3), there is no teaching, suggestion or disclosure of a substantially flat or concave nose as recited by the pending claims. In addition, because removal of the nose 101 would foreshorten the compression surface S and leave an unfinished threaded portion T, Bowcutt cannot be understood as teaching, suggesting or disclosing operation of that reference's projectile without the tip 101. (Bowcutt, col. 4, ln. 63 to col. 5, ln. 9; Fig. 1). Furthermore, because Bowcutt is concerned with propelling a projectile at velocities of greater than Mach 5, Bowcutt teaches away from a projectile with a nose that is substantially flat or concave, or a nose that is adapted to inhibit deflection of the projectile from a face of rock in an excavation.

For the reasons set forth above, the Bowcutt reference does not teach, suggest or disclose a system for launching a projectile to remove a body of rock in an excavation as claimed.

Furthermore, the Bowcutt reference teaches away from specific structural aspects of the claimed system. Accordingly, the rejections of Claims 1-8 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Application No. 10/055,797

New Claims 37-39 depend from Claim 1, and recite specific projectile nose configurations disclosed by the specification. Therefore, Claims 37-39 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 37-39 do not add new matter.

Attached hereto is a marked up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment, captioned "VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE."

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

Bradley M. Knepper

Registration No. 44,189

1560 Broadway, Suite 1200

Denver, Colorado 80202-5141

(303) 863-9700

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MICKE et al.

Serial No.: 10/005,797

Filed: November 2, 2001

Atty. File No.: 3957-8-DIV

For: "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR

REMOVING OBSTRUCTIONS IN

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

MINES"

Dear Sir:

Group Art Unit: 3643

Examiner: Price, Richard Thomas Jr.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

"EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL NUMBER: EL923668676US DATE OF DEPOSIT: 2/21/03

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE" SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.10 ON THE DATE INDICATED ABOVE AND IS ADDRESSED TO THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231.

TYPED OR PRINTED NAME: Aimee M. Thuerk

Applicant submits this Amendment and Response to address the Office Action having a mailing date of December 3, 2002. Although the Applicant believes that no fees are due for filing this Amendment and Response, please charge any fees deemed necessary to Deposit Account No. 19-1970. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks:

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

1. (Once Amended) A system for launching a projectile to remove a body of rock in an excavation, comprising:

a projectile that includes:

a nose, the nose being one of substantially flat and concave to inhibit deflection of the projectile from a face of the rock;

a body containing an explosive charge; and

a tail having a plurality of [transversely oriented] fins to control the trajectory of the projectile; and

a tube for launching the projectile.

Claims 37-39 are new.

EXHIBIT B

OIPE		
AUG 2 8 2003 E AUG 2 8 2003 E POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE	EL 92366676 DENTOWNS	
ORIGINIFOSTATUSEONEY PO ZIP Code BO 2 D 2 Day of Delivery 2 4 9 Flat Rate Envelope Date In Date In No. 2 Day Year Time In Military No. 1 Day Year Return Receipt Fee	SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR SERVICE GUARANTEE AND LIMITES ON INSURANCE COVERAGE	Label 11-F August 2000
	WAIVER OF SIGNATURE (Domestic Only): Additional merchandise insurance is void if waiver of signature is requested. I wish delivery to be made without obtaining signature of addressee of addressee of agent (if delivery employee) judges that article can be left in secure location) and I authorize that delivery employee's signature constitutes valid proof of delivery. NO DELIVERY Weekend Holiday Customer Signature Federal Agency Acct. No. or Postal Service Acct. No. or	!
FROM: (PLEASE PRINT) FROM: (PLEASE PRINT) PHONE (SEER IDAN ROSS PC 1060 BROADWAY STE 1200 CENVER CO 80202-5145	TO: please PRINT) PHONE () COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS WASHINGTON DC 20231-0001	A JZ T IZ
3957-8-DIV AMT	-222-1811 www.usps.com 三星前 多	432

Initiai: AM1: Date 2/21/03 PTO Stamp indicates receipt of: [] Trademark Matter [X] Patent Matter MAR 0 6 2003 Application Docket No.: 3957-8-DIV Applicant: MICKE et al. Title or Mark: "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REMOVING OBSTRUCTIONS IN MINES"
Serial/Reg. No.: 10/005,797 Filed/Issued Date: November 2, 2001 # of Pages in Specification [] Certificate of Mailing # of Pages in Claims [X] Express Mail No.: EL923668676US # of Sheets in Drawings **Check for \$ 180.00 # of Pages in Seq. Listing LIST ALL DOCUMENTS BEING SENT TO PATENT OFFICE:

Amendment and Response; Information Disclosure Statement; PTO Form 1449; copies of three references



EXHIBIT C

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MICKE et al.

Serial No.: 10/005,797

Filed: November 2, 2001

Atty. File No.: 3957-8-DIV

For: "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR

REMOVING OBSTRUCTIONS IN

MINES"

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313

Dear Sir:

Group Art Unit: 3643

Examiner: Price, Richard Thomas Jr.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

"EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL NUMBER: EV 331292390 US DATE OF DEPOSIT: 7/18/03

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE" SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.10 ON THE DATE INDICATED ABOVE AND IS ADDRESSED TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450.

TYPED OR PRINTED NAME: Amy S. Duarte

SEP 0 4 2003

GROUP 3600

On July 11, 2003, the office of Applicants' attorney was contacted by the Examiner regarding the status of a reply to the Office Action having a mailing date of December 3, 2002. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the Patent Office had no record of having received a reply to that Office Action.

On February 21, 2003, an Amendment and Response in reply to the Office Action of December 3, 2002, was mailed to the Patent Office under a Certificate of Mailing in accordance with 37 CRF § 1.8. A postcard receipt submitted to the Patent Office with the Amendment and Response, and date stamped by the OIPE on February 21, 2003, was received by the office of the Applicants' attorneys on March 6, 2003, and evidences the timely filing of the Amendment and Response (see Exhibit A). The accompanying Declaration of Aimee Thuerk and the attachments thereto also evidence the timely filing of the Amendment and Response (see Exhibit B). A copy of the Amendment and Response submitted on February 21, 2003 is submitted herewith (see Exhibit C).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Amendment and Response originally submitted on February 21, 2003, be considered timely filed. Although no fees are believed due in connection with the filing of this request, please charge any fees deemed necessary to Deposit Account No. 19-1970.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By:_

Bradley 44 Knepp

Registration No. 44,189 1560 Broadway, Suite 1200

Denver, Colorado 80202-5141

(303) 863-9700

Date:





Date 2/21/03 [] Trademark Malte CE/VED Initial: AM1 [X] Patent Matter PTO Stamp indicates receipt of: Application Docket No.: 3957-8-DIV MAR 0.6200 Applicant: MICKE et al. Title or Mark: "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REMOVING OBSTRUCTIONS IN MINES" Serial/Reg. No.: 10/005,797 # of Pages in Specification Filed/Issued Date: November 2, 2001 # of Pages in Claims [] Certificate of Mailing [X] Express Mail No.: EL923668676US # of Sheets in Drawings 1 Check for \$ 150.00 # of Pages in Seq. Listing LIST ALL DOCUMENTS BEING SENT TO PATENT OFFICE:

Amendment and Response; Information Disclosure Statement; PTO Form 1449; copies of three references



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re the Application of: MICKE et al. Serial No.: 10/005,797 Filed: November 2, 2001 Atty. File No.: 3957-8-DIV For: "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR

REMOVING OBSTRUCTIONS IN

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313

MINES"

Dear Sir:

Group Art Unit: 3643

Examiner: Price, Richard Thomas Jr.

DECLARATION OF AIMEE M. THUERK IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

"EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL NUMBER: EV331292390 US DATE OF DEPOSIT: 7/18/03

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE" SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.10 ON THE DATE INDICATED ABOVE AND IS ADDRESSED TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450.

TYPED OR PRINTED NAME

SEP 0 4 2003

I, Aimee M. Thurek, declare and state as follows:

- I am a secretary employed by Sheridan Ross P.C., the attorneys of record for the above-referenced application.
- 2. On February 21, 2003, I prepared an Amendment and Response for signature by Bradley M. Knepper.
- 3. Following Mr. Knepper's signature on the Amendment and Response, I also signed the Certificate of Mailing. I then prepared a stamped, self-addressed return postcard for mailing to the Patent Office. I placed the completed Amendment and Response and completed return postcard in an Express Mail envelope addressed to Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, and sealed the envelope. Copies of the February 21, 2003 Amendment and Response (Exhibit A), postcard (Exhibit B), and Express Mail receipt (Exhibit C) are attached. The postcard identifies the Amendment and Response and additional documents submitted with the Amendment

and Response, namely, an Information Disclosure Statement, PTO Form 1449, and copies of references.

- 4. Pursuant to Sheridan Ross P.C.'s procedures, I then personally placed the envelope in the mail department at Sheridan Ross P.C. prior to 5:00 p.m. for Express Mail postage processing and deposit with the United States Post Office.
- 5. The return postcard, date stamped by the OIPE on February 21, 2003, was received by Sheridan Ross P.C. on March 6, 2003. A copy of the date stamped postcard is attached as Exhibit B.

Date: 7-18-03

Aimee M. Thurek



EXHIBIT D

TPE VC			<u> </u>	raellacharpe ²⁷ meinde maas an
2 5 9 3000 STREET WAS THE TRIE WAS TAKEN THE TRICE BOTH			Customer C	
		EXPRESS MAIL SPOSTAL SERVICE® P	osionics to Addres	
OBJECTED US Flat Rate Envelop OBJECTED US OBJECTED US	Delivery, Attemp	Time DPM 8	iployee Signature	
Date In Mo. Day Cear 12 Noon 3 PM \$ Time by Military Return Receipt Fe	선생님의 전기를 가지하다.	□ AM □ PM □ PM □ Time	The Signature Si	
Weight Int'l Alpha Country Code COD Fee Ins Dis. Oze	addressee on add	SIGNATURE (Corresto Only) Additions are in Fegurated. Evident delivery to be in cases a signific if delivery employee and force that delivery employee a significant of the corresponding of the corre	I merchandise insurance is void it acids without obtaining signature of great article can be left in secure e constituties valid proof of delivery e	
Weekend Holiday CUSTOMER USE ONLY METHOD OF PAYMENT: Express filal Corporate Acct. No.	Poderal Agency Acct Postal Service Acct.	No. of No.	Customer Signature by ASSESSE AND THE STREET OF THE STREET	
FROM: PLEASE PRINT) PHONE() SHERIDAN RUSS PC 1166 UROADHAY-STE 1200	COMMI	15510NER FOR	PATENTS	7 7
DENVER CO 8020	2-5145 SLEX/		- VA - 2231 3-1	120
3957-8-DIV/QSC	2 CALL 1-800-222-181	1 www.usps.com	ZEMS	
You are making 3 copies: FOR PICKUP OR THACKING	GALL 1-800-222-101			<u> </u>

nitial: asd	Table American Company of the Compan		Date 7/18/03	
TO Stamp indicates receipt of: [X]	Patent Matter	[] Trademar	k Matter	!
Application Docket No.: 3957-8-DIV				; i
Applicant: MICKE et al.			PEO.	
itle or Mark: "METHOD AND APPARAT	US FOR REME	TYNG OBST	TRUCTIONS IN MINES E/VEN	1
Serial/Reg. No.: 10/055,797		~ (g)	00/28,20	
iled/Issued Date: November 2, 2001		2002	SHERID 2003	
i Certificate of Mailing	301	2083 🐉 -	No. of Pages in Specification	Serv
X] Express Mail No.: EV331292390US	(A)	A CONTRACT	No. of Pages in Claims	
! Check for \$	A TRADE	N. C.	No. of Sheets of Drawings	
JIST ALL DOCUMENTS BEING SENT	TO PATENT OF	FICE:		

4.4

Request for Consideration of Amendment and Response (w/exhibits attached thereto)
(Exhibit A-copy of date stamped postcard receipt)
(Exhibit B-Declaration of Aimee M. Thurek)
(Exhibit C-Copy of Amendment and Response)



EXHIBIT A

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Group Art Unit: 3643 the Application of: Examiner: Price, Richard Thomas Jr. MICKE et al. AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE Serial No.: 10/005,797 Filed: November 2, 2001 "EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL NUMBER: EL923668676US DATE OF DEPOSIT: 2/21/03 I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO Atty. File No.: 3957-8-DIV ADDRESSEE* SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.10 ON THE DATE INDICATED ABOVE AND IS ADDRESSED TO THE ASSISTANT For: "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231. REMOVING OBSTRUCTIONS IN MINES"

Dear Sir:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

Applicant submits this Amendment and Response to address the Office Action having a mailing date of December 3, 2002. Although the Applicant believes that no fees are due for filing this Amendment and Response, please charge any fees deemed necessary to Deposit Account No. 19-1970. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks:

RECEIVED

SEP 0 4 2003

GROUP 3600



AMENDMENTS

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend Claim 1 and add new Claims 37-39 as follows:

1. (Once Amended) A system for launching a projectile to remove a body of rock in an excavation, comprising:

a projectile that includes:

a nose, the nose being one of substantially flat and concave to inhibit deflection of the projectile from a face of the rock;

a body containing an explosive charge; and

a tail having a plurality of fins to control the trajectory of the projectile;

and

a tube for launching the projectile.



- 37. (New) The system of Claim 1, wherein said nose is concave.
- 38. (New) The system of Claim 1, wherein said nose is substantially flat.
- 39. (New) The system of Claim 1, wherein said nose has a diameter that is about equal to a maximum diameter of said projectile.

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Action dated December 3, 2002. In the amendments set forth above, Claim 1 has been amended without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter, and without narrowing the claim, Claims 37-39 are new, and no claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-8 and 37-39 are now pending. As set out more fully below, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,485,787 to Bowcutt et al. ("Bowcutt"). In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. (MPEP §2143). It is submitted that a *prima facie* case to reject Claims 1-8 has not been established. In particular, and as discussed more fully below, Bowcutt does not teach, suggest or disclose at least the feature of a projectile having a nose that is one of substantially flat and concave. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Claims 1-8 are not obvious in view of Bowcutt.

The Bowcutt reference is generally directed to a gas gun launched scramjet test projectile. The test projectile discussed by Bowcutt is designed to travel at velocities greater than Mach 5.

The projectile is propulsion-assisted and is used to enable the simulation of flow physics and the acquisition of performance data that correlates directly to those of a scramjet powered vehicle.

(Bowcutt, col. 4, lns. 5-7). Accordingly, the projectile discussed by Bowcutt is concerned with

the integration of the air frame and propulsion systems for vehicles or projectiles traveling at supersonic and hypersonic speeds. (See Bowcutt, col. 1, lns. 27-30). The projectile illustrated by Bowcutt includes a nose cap 101 secured to the forebody 102 to form an external surface that extends from the projectile nose tip 103 rearwardly to the vicinity of the leading edge of the cowl 110. (Bowcutt, col. 5, lns. 5-9). Because the projectile 100 is intended to travel at velocities greater than Mach 5 (Bowcutt Abstract, Claim 1), and because parameters that include the forebody and inlet contraction ratios, the inlet efficiency, etc., impacts the performance of ramiet and scramjet systems (Bowcutt, col. 1, ln. 65 to col. 2, ln. 3), there is no teaching, suggestion or disclosure of a substantially flat or concave nose as recited by the pending claims. In addition, because removal of the nose 101 would foreshorten the compression surface S and leave an unfinished threaded portion T. Bowcutt cannot be understood as teaching, suggesting or disclosing operation of that reference's projectile without the tip 101. (Bowcutt, col. 4, ln. 63 to col. 5, ln. 9; Fig. 1). Furthermore, because Bowcutt is concerned with propelling a projectile at velocities of greater than Mach 5, Bowcutt teaches away from a projectile with a nose that is substantially flat or concave, or a nose that is adapted to inhibit deflection of the projectile from a face of rock in an excavation.

For the reasons set forth above, the Bowcutt reference does not teach, suggest or disclose a system for launching a projectile to remove a body of rock in an excavation as claimed.

Furthermore, the Bowcutt reference teaches away from specific structural aspects of the claimed system. Accordingly, the rejections of Claims 1-8 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Application No. 10/055,797

New Claims 37-39 depend from Claim 1, and recite specific projectile nose configurations disclosed by the specification. Therefore, Claims 37-39 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 37-39 do not add new matter.

Attached hereto is a marked up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment, captioned "VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE."

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By:

Bradley M. Knepper

Registration No. 44,189

1560 Broadway, Suite 1200

Denver, Colorado 80202-5141

(303) 863-9700

Date:

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

1. (Once Amended) A system for launching a projectile to remove a body of rock in an excavation, comprising:

a projectile that includes:

a nose, the nose being one of substantially flat and concave to inhibit deflection of the projectile from a face of the rock;

a body containing an explosive charge; and

a tail having a plurality of [transversely oriented] fins to control the trajectory of the projectile; and

a tube for launching the projectile.

Claims 37-39 are new.



EXHIBIT B



Date 2/21/03 Initial: AM1 Trademark Matter (FIVE) [X] Patent Matter PTO Stamp indicates receipt of: Application Docket No.: 3957-8-DIV

Applicant: MICKE et al.

Title or Mark: "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REMOVING OBSTRUCTIONS IN MINES" Serial/Reg. No.: 10/005,797 # of Pages in Specification Filed/Issued Date: November 2, 2001 # of Pages in Claims [] Certificate of Mailing [X] Express Mail No.: EL923668676US # of Sheets in Drawings Theck for \$ 180.00 # of Pages in Seq. Listing LIST ALL DOCUMENTS BEING SENT TO PATENT OFFICE:

Amendment and Response; Information Disclosure Statement; PTO Form 1449; copies of three references



EXHIBIT C



000 A 0	Customer Cop	0.67 0.4 0.4		ଧ ଅ ଶ ଶ
Total E	SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR COLOR SEEN OF COLOR C	Federal Agency Act. No. or Postal Sarvice Act. No. TO: PLEASE PRINT) PHONE	COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS WASHINGTON OC 20231-0001	
POST TO A	Do 2 P Code	METHOD OF PAYMENT: Expense NAIL Corporate Acet. No. FROM: (PLEASE PRINT) PHONE (SHERIDAN ROSS RC 1560 BROADWAY STE 1200 DENVER CO 80202-5145	FOR PLEKUP OF TRACKING PAIL 1-800



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

the Application of:

MICKE et al.

Serial No.: 10/005,797

Filed: November 2, 2001

Atty. File No.: 3957-8-DIV

For: "METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR

REMOVING OBSTRUCTIONS IN

MINES"

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

Group Art Unit: 3643

Examiner: Price, Richard Thomas Jr.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

"EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL NUMBER: EL923668676US DATE OF DEPOSIT: 2/21/03

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE: "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE" SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.10 ON THE DATE INDICATED ABOVE AND IS ADDRESSED TO THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231.

TYPED OR PRINTED NAME: Aimee M. Thuerk

GNATURE: (1 MIL M) - Thrue

Applicant submits this Amendment and Response to address the Office Action having a mailing date of December 3, 2002. Although the Applicant believes that no fees are due for filing this Amendment and Response, please charge any fees deemed necessary to Deposit Account No. 19-1970. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks:

RECEVED



AMENDMENTS

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend Claim 1 and add new Claims 37-39 as follows:

 (Once Amended) A system for launching a projectile to remove a body of rock in an excavation, comprising:

a projectile that includes:

a nose, the nose being one of substantially flat and concave to inhibit deflection of the projectile from a face of the rock;

a body containing an explosive charge; and

a tail having a plurality of fins to control the trajectory of the projectile;

and

a tube for launching the projectile.



- 37. (New) The system of Claim 1, wherein said nose is conca GROUP 3600
- 38. (New) The system of Claim 1, wherein said nose is substantially flat.
- 39. (New) The system of Claim 1, wherein said nose has a diameter that is about equal to a maximum diameter of said projectile.

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Action dated December 3, 2002. In the amendments set forth above, Claim 1 has been amended without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter, and without narrowing the claim, Claims 37-39 are new, and no claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-8 and 37-39 are now pending. As set out more fully below, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,485,787 to Bowcutt et al. ("Bowcutt"). In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. (MPEP §2143). It is submitted that a *prima facie* case to reject Claims 1-8 has not been established. In particular, and as discussed more fully below, Bowcutt does not teach, suggest or disclose at least the feature of a projectile having a nose that is one of substantially flat and concave. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Claims 1-8 are not obvious in view of Bowcutt.

The Bowcutt reference is generally directed to a gas gun launched scramjet test projectile. The test projectile discussed by Bowcutt is designed to travel at velocities greater than Mach 5.

The projectile is propulsion-assisted and is used to enable the simulation of flow physics and the acquisition of performance data that correlates directly to those of a scramjet powered vehicle.

(Bowcutt, col. 4, lns. 5-7). Accordingly, the projectile discussed by Bowcutt is concerned with

the integration of the air frame and propulsion systems for vehicles or projectiles traveling at supersonic and hypersonic speeds. (See Bowcutt, col. 1, lns. 27-30). The projectile illustrated by Bowcutt includes a nose cap 101 secured to the forebody 102 to form an external surface that extends from the projectile nose tip 103 rearwardly to the vicinity of the leading edge of the cowl 110. (Bowcutt, col. 5, lns. 5-9). Because the projectile 100 is intended to travel at velocities greater than Mach 5 (Bowcutt Abstract, Claim 1), and because parameters that include the forebody and inlet contraction ratios, the inlet efficiency, etc., impacts the performance of ramjet and scramjet systems (Bowcutt, col. 1, ln. 65 to col. 2, ln. 3), there is no teaching, suggestion or disclosure of a substantially flat or concave nose as recited by the pending claims. In addition, because removal of the nose 101 would foreshorten the compression surface S and leave an unfinished threaded portion T. Bowcutt cannot be understood as teaching, suggesting or disclosing operation of that reference's projectile without the tip 101. (Bowcutt, col. 4, ln. 63 to col. 5, ln. 9; Fig. 1). Furthermore, because Bowcutt is concerned with propelling a projectile at velocities of greater than Mach 5, Bowcutt teaches away from a projectile with a nose that is substantially flat or concave, or a nose that is adapted to inhibit deflection of the projectile from a face of rock in an excavation.

For the reasons set forth above, the Bowcutt reference does not teach, suggest or disclose a system for launching a projectile to remove a body of rock in an excavation as claimed.

Furthermore, the Bowcutt reference teaches away from specific structural aspects of the claimed system. Accordingly, the rejections of Claims 1-8 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Application No. 10/055,797

New Claims 37-39 depend from Claim 1, and recite specific projectile nose configurations disclosed by the specification. Therefore, Claims 37-39 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 37-39 do not add new matter.

Attached hereto is a marked up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment, captioned "VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE."

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By:⊿

Bradley M. Knepper /

Registration No. 44,189

1560 Broadway, Suite 1200

Denver, Colorado 80202-5141

(303) 863-9700

Date:

Application No. 10/055,797

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

1. (Once Amended) A system for launching a projectile to remove a body of rock in an excavation, comprising:

a projectile that includes:

a nose, the nose being one of substantially flat and concave to inhibit deflection of the projectile from a face of the rock;

a body containing an explosive charge; and

a tail having a plurality of [transversely oriented] fins to control the trajectory of the projectile; and

a tube for launching the projectile.

Claims 37-39 are new.